WA7 8967 6-4-09 4a



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 10

1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900 Seattle, Washington 98101-3140

JUN - 4 2009

Reply To: OCE-127

Mr. Ron Skinnarland Waste Management Section Manager Washington Department of Ecology 3100 Port of Benton Blvd. Richland, Washington 99352

Dear Mr. Skinnarland:

This letter is to convey to you the United States Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) report and comments for the oversight inspection conducted by your staff at U. S. Department of Ecology Hanford on April 14, 2009. As you can see, the report is in a checklist format with recommendations at the end for ways to improve the inspection and the report. Please share this information with your staff that participated in conducting the inspection.

Sincerely,

Jeff KenKnight. Manager Air/ RCRA Compliance Unit

cc: Jack Boller, EPA

Reply To: OCE-127

Mr. Ron Skinnarland
Waste Management Section Manager
Washington Department of Ecology
3100 Port of Benton Blvd.
Richland, Washington 99352

Dear Mr. Skinnarland:

This letter is to convey to you the United States Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) report and comments for the oversight inspection conducted by your staff at U. S. Department of Ecology Hanford on April 14, 2009. As you can see, the report is in a checklist format with recommendations at the end for ways to improve the inspection and the report. Please share this information with your staff that participated in conducting the inspection.

Sincerely,

Jeff KenKnight. Manager Air/ RCRA Compliance Unit

cc: Jack Boller, EPA

bcc: Barbara McCullough

N:\APPS\OCE\Air-RCRA\RCRA Oversight Inspection Letters\US DOE Hanford RCRA Oversight Inspection letter.doc

Region 10 RCRA Oversight Inspection Report

Instructions:

The form is divided into two parts. Part 1 is used during the actual inspection to record observations made in the field. Part 2 of the form is used to evaluate the State inspection report relative to field observations. Both parts of the oversight inspection report have to be completed by the EPA oversight inspector. In the remarks column, N/A may be appropriate in some instances.

Inspector	: Jack Bolle		Date: 4	114/09
		<u>Par</u>	<u>†1</u>	
I.	Facility Name:	US DOF	Hanford	n i sa
	EPA ID#: _ W	A 7 89000 8	767	
	X	Used Oil		
	" l. -	Conditionally Ex	empt Small Quantity	y Generator
	Facility Activities	:S	mall Quantity Genera	ator
		<u>X_</u>	enerator	
i.		T	ransporter	
		XTı	eatment/Storage/Dis	sposal Facility
		V	niversal Waste	
П.	Inspection Type:	CEI		O & M
		CME		Lab Audit
lli.		Financial Records Review		Compliance ing Evaluation
		Non Financial Records Review		CDI
		Other (spe	cify)	·
	Items to be Reviewed:	Full Scope	<u> </u>	Limited Scope
	Inspection Format:	Joint Visit	In	dependent Visit

ш.	EPA Oversight Inspector:Jack	Boller		
	Organization: EPA RIU			
	Telephone: 206 553 - 299	73		
IV.	Inspection Date(s): 4/14/09		<u>, II</u> 188	
V.	Pre-Inspection Review	Yes No	Remarks	-
	Did the State inspector arrange the logistics of the inspection by assuring:			
	a. facility actively operating?	<u>X</u> _	EI .	
	b. EPA properly notified?	<u>X</u>	12 ^{- 12}	_
ę	2. Did the State transmit requested documents according to the established schedule?		N/A	
	3. Was the inspector prepared to conduct the inspection? The inspector should have pertinent information (permit application, previous inspection reports, waste types handled) and equipment (safety and sampling)?	Υ _	30 V	
e et	4. Did the inspector present the appropriate identification and advise the owner/operator of the purpose of the inspection and briefly describe the agenda?	<u> </u>		

VI.	Facility	Information	(Observations):
7 4.	T CONTERT	THITOTHIUMOOT	

	[9]		3	
1.	Did the inspector demonstrate or obtain knowledge of the facility processes and an understanding of its RCRA history?	Yes	No	Remarks
2.	Did the inspector conduct a thorough walk-through of the industrial processes and associated areas in the facility?	X		
3.	Did the inspector fail to note any violations or improper waste handling activities?	(=) -	X	MILO = all I A a
4.	Did the inspector fail to identify any hazardous waste handling areas not previously identified in previous reports or records?		人	
5.	Upon identifying a potential violation, did the inspector initiate case development procedures (i.e., gather detailed evidence to support the findings of violations?	X	5	
6.	Did the inspector check the requirements for preparedness and prevention, including adequate aisle space, emergency equipment availability, and access to communications during hazardous waste handling operations?	X	-	
7.	If applicable, was sampling performed by State personnel in accordance with standard operating procedures specified by the State and/or EPA?			N/A

			Yes	No	Remarks
	8.	Was proper safety and sampling			
		equipment used to perform the sampling?			
	9.	Was the inspector helpful to the owner/operator by proving explanation of the regulations?	X) -
D+	10.	Was the inspector able to answer questions accurately or commit to provide answers at a later date?	<u>X</u>		
55 V	11.	If the facility was permitted, did the inspector determine compliance with permit-specific conditions?	<u>X</u>		
	12.	Did the inspector perform an exit interview with the owner/operator summarizing the key findings of the inspection?	X		
S.		NOTE: The inspector should not make a finding of violation during the inspection, but should only discuss the first should not make a finding of violation and the first should not make a finding of violation during the inspector should not make a finding of violation during the inspection during the inspection of violation during the inspection of violation during the inspection during the ins	t)
<u>VII.</u>	Knov	vledge of the Regulations			Σi .
	1.	Was the inspector knowledgeable about hazardous waste regulations applicable to the facility?	$\overline{\chi}$	_	- N
	2.	Was the inspector aware of recent amendments to the regulations that may affect the conduct of the inspection?	<u>}</u>	ā1	# ==

<u>VШ.</u>	Document Inspection (Review)		nden num - dune eine neime	
.00	(Please note if review was perform	rmed pi	rior to o	r during inspection.)
1.	Did the inspector thoroughly review the following documents	?	34	
A.	For Generators:	Yes	No	Remarks
	 Inspection records for hazardous waste storage areas 	X	_	
	Personnel training records	X	fe	·
	Contingency plan	X		- 1
- 1	 Emergency equipment testing and maintenance records 	<u>X</u>	_	= 8 N 2. 8
	Waste analysis records	X		
20	Manifests and exception reports	X	Δ =	
	 State annual and/or EPA biennial reports 	χ_		
	Waste minimization plan	7	1 <u>1</u>	
B.	In addition, for TSDF's:		•	
	 Part A permit application or final issued permit 	X		
	Part B application prior to permit issuance		_	N/A
	Operating record	$\overline{\chi}$		
		Yes	No	Remarks

Waste analysis plan

	• Inspection schedule	X		
- 1	Closure and Post Closure Plan	X		
	Financial instruments	$\overline{\chi}$		
	 Ground Water Monitoring/Reports 			N/A
	• Other information (treatment plant operations, internal correspondence)	_		NA
0	<u>P</u>	art 2		37 - 324 38 - 33
	INSPECTION	REPOR	RT REV	IEW
				77 X 32
I.	Review of Inspection Report	Yes	No	Remarks
	1. Did the inspector submit the completed inspection			
	report within the established workplan deadlines?	X	_	29
	2. Did the inspection report contain factual observation rather than opinion?	××	·	26 S
	Comments:			

3. Was the report accurate and did it sufficiently document all the violations? Were the regulations interpreted correctly? 4. Did the report contain a discussion of changes that have occurred at the facility since the previous inspection? If not, explain items that should have been included: 5. Did the inspector report accurately reflect the EPA oversight inspector's observations? If not, explain the differences. 6. If non compliance was identified, was the violator identified, was the violator identified as either a Secondary Violator or a Significant non-complier? Remarks 1. What is your overall assessment of the inspection and the inspection report? The inspection was Canducted			Yes No	Remarks
discussion of changes that have occurred at the facility since the previous inspection? If not, explain items that should have been included: 5. Did the inspection report accurately reflect the EPA oversight inspector's observations? If not, explain the differences. 6. If non compliance was identified, was the violator identified as either a Secondary Violator or a Significant non-complier? Remarks 1. What is your overall assessment of the inspection and the inspection report?	3.	did it sufficiently document all the violations? Were the regulations interpreted		
accurately reflect the EPA oversight inspector's observations? If not, explain the differences. 6. If non compliance was identified, was the violator identified as either a Secondary Violator or a Significant non-complier? Remarks 1. What is your overall assessment of the inspection and the inspection report?	4.	discussion of changes that have occurred at the facility since the previous inspection? If not, explain items that	_ X Non	
accurately reflect the EPA oversight inspector's observations? If not, explain the differences. 6. If non compliance was identified, was the violator identified as either a Secondary Violator or a Significant non-complier? Remarks 1. What is your overall assessment of the inspection and the inspection report?				
accurately reflect the EPA oversight inspector's observations? If not, explain the differences. 6. If non compliance was identified, was the violator identified as either a Secondary Violator or a Significant non-complier? Remarks 1. What is your overall assessment of the inspection and the inspection report?		- 50 mins.	IIII II te	S Callell C C
identified, was the violator identified as either a Secondary Violator or a Significant non-complier? Remarks 1. What is your overall assessment of the inspection and the inspection report?	5.	accurately reflect the EPA oversight inspector's observations? If not,	<u>×</u>	<u>- 1</u>
identified, was the violator identified as either a Secondary Violator or a Significant non-complier? Remarks 1. What is your overall assessment of the inspection and the inspection report?		71: - 1		
identified, was the violator identified as either a Secondary Violator or a Significant non-complier? Remarks 1. What is your overall assessment of the inspection and the inspection report?				
identified, was the violator identified as either a Secondary Violator or a Significant non-complier? Remarks 1. What is your overall assessment of the inspection and the inspection report?				a s
1. What is your overall assessment of the inspection and the inspection report?	6.	identified, was the violator identified as either a Secondary Violator or a	<u>×</u>	2. A
report?	Rem	arks		
incontra a company	1.	The inspect	ion was	conducted nner. The
the facility and the applicable or aulations.		the facility and	the analic	wask, ot

II.

None
NOTE: Indicate whether the inspector is in need of additional training or i lacking a particular skill (e.g. hazardous waste sampling) needed f adequate inspection.
Comments on the inspection that could have a bearing on the State inspector evaluation (e.g., facility status under litigation, inadequate time allocated to perform inspection, complex industrial processes and waste handling praction numerous regulated units located on site).
evaluation (e.g., facility status under litigation, inadequate time allocated to perform inspection, complex industrial processes and waste handling practi-
evaluation (e.g., facility status under litigation, inadequate time allocated to perform inspection, complex industrial processes and waste handling praction or numerous regulated units located on site).
evaluation (e.g., facility status under litigation, inadequate time allocated to perform inspection, complex industrial processes and waste handling praction or numerous regulated units located on site).